

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. Takeshi Inao P/1071-1600 10/674,451 09/30/2003 4123 EXAMINER 2352 7590 08/01/2005 OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN RACHUBA, MAURINA T 1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER NEW YORK, NY 100368403 3723

DATE MAILED: 08/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					W
		Application	ı No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/674,451	ı	INAO, TAKESHI	
		Examiner		Art Unit	
		M Rachuba		3723	
The MAILING DAT Period for Reply	TE of this communication a	appears on the	cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE MAILING DATE OF  Extensions of time may be avail after SIX (6) MONTHS from the  If the period for reply specified a  If NO period for reply is specified  Followed to reply within the set or	TORY PERIOD FOR REF THIS COMMUNICATION able under the provisions of 37 CFR mailing date of this communication. bove is less than thirty (30) days, a red d above, the maximum statutory period extended period for reply will, by stat later than three months after the main See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no even reply within the statut od will apply and will tute, cause the applic	t, however, may a reply be to ory minimum of thirty (30) da expire SIX (6) MONTHS from altion to become ABANDON	imely filed  ys will be considered timely.  n the mailing date of this con ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nmunication.
Status	•				
2a)☐ This action is FINA 3)☐ Since this applicat	nmunication(s) filed on <u>26</u> AL. 2b)⊠ TI ion is in condition for allow nce with the practice unde	his action is no vance except f	or formal matters, p		merits is
Disposition of Claims					
4a) Of the above of 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>15-20</u> is/7) ☐ Claim(s) is/	are rejected.	rawn from cons			
Application Papers				•	
10)⊠ The drawing(s) file Applicant may not re Replacement drawi	s objected to by the Examid on 30 September 2003 is equest that any objection to the sheet(s) including the compation is objected to by the	is/are: a)⊠ ac he drawing(s) be rection is require	e held in abeyance. So d if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFI	R 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119				
a)⊠ All b)□ Some  1.⊠ Certified co  2.□ Certified co  3.□ Copies of the application	s made of a claim for forei  * c)  None of:  pies of the priority docume  pies of the priority docume  ne certified copies of the pi  from the International Burd  etailed Office action for a l	ents have beer ents have beer riority docume eau (PCT Rule	n received. n received in Applica nts have been receive 17.2(a)).	ntion No ved in this National S	Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (2) Notice of Draftsperson's Pat 3) Information Disclosure State Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/30/	ent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ment(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0	08)	4) Interview Summan Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:		-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/674,451

Art Unit: 3723

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

Claims 1-14 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR
 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 26 May 2005.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
   The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 15 limits a driving unit for driving at least one of the rotating shaft and the workpiece in "the vertical direction of the rotating shaft, in the horizontal direction of the rotating shaft...". A rotating shaft has an axis of rotation that extends in only one direction. Applicant has not defined what the other directions are. How does the shaft have a vertical and a horizontal direction? Regarding claim 18, it is not clear how sensing the electrical characteristic of the *rotary* driving unit is used to detect contact between the workpiece and tool, as the contact is initiated through linear movement of the tool and workpiece, and not the rotation of the shaft holding and rotating the tool. Based on the specification, the examiner assumes that applicant means that the vertical/horizontal driving unit is providing the electrical characteristic.

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 10/674,451

Art Unit: 3723

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. Claims 15, 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Fivian, 4,142,333. '333 discloses the claimed invention, where the sides or flanks of the teeth are considered to be the sides of the grooves. The detector 11 detects the wear of the wheel and axially positionally readjusts the wheel relative to the workpiece. Please refer to column 5, lines 44-49.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Application/Control Number: 10/674,451

Art Unit: 3723

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

- 8. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fivian, '333. '333 does not disclose the abrasive grains having a cutting depth of about 10 nm or less. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the tool of '333 with an abrasive grain cutting depth of 10 nm or less, dependent on the workpiece, the material of the workpiece, and the degree of material removal/surface polish desired, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.
- 9. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Numoto et al, US006027398A. '333 discloses a mechanical feeler to detect the size of the tool, used to determine the position of the tool relative to the workpiece. '333 does not disclose using an electrical characteristic of the rotary driving unit, where in the sensor is a Hall sensor for detecting the magnetic field of the rotary driving unit. '398, in a polishing device, teaches the use of a Hall sensor to determine the position of the polishing tool relative to the workpiece. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided '333 with the Hall sensor to determine the position of the tool relative to the workpiece, to more accurately determine the relative positions, see column 3, lines 1-20.

Application/Control Number: 10/674,451

Art Unit: 3723

#### Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Other similar groove polishing tools are cited of interest.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M Rachuba whose telephone number is 571-272-4493. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail can be reached on 571-272-4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M Rachuba Primary Examiner Art Unit 3723